

## New York Tribune.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1914.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, Office: 100 N. York St., New York. Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1879, under Post Office No. 154, New York, N. Y., under Act of March 3, 1879, authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1911, approved October 3, 1911, under Act of October 3, 1911, approved October 3, 1911.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES.**—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of New York City. Daily, 10¢; Sunday, 5¢. In Advance: 3 months, \$2.75; 6 months, \$5.00; 1 year, \$9.00. Single Copies, 5¢.

**FOREIGN RATES.**—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of New York City. Daily, 15¢; Sunday, 10¢. In Advance: 3 months, \$4.50; 6 months, \$8.00; 1 year, \$12.00. Single Copies, 10¢.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1879.

The Tribune uses its best endeavors to insure the truthfulness of every advertisement it prints and to avoid the publication of any advertisements containing misleading statements or claims.

## The Surrender of Antwerp.

The fall of Antwerp was clearly foreshadowed by the fate of Liège, Namur and Mauberge. This war has quickly demonstrated that the development of land fortifications has not kept pace with the development of siege artillery. The newest fortresses in Europe are not modern in the sense in which the newest Krupp howitzers are modern. In the competition between the military engineer and the gun manufacturer the former has to confess himself outstripped.

Liège and Namur were considered up-to-date fortresses. They were constructed on the outlying ring principle and were intended to endure bombardment by the most powerful long range guns. But neither could withstand the terrific fire of the German siege batteries. The only problem for the besiegers was to establish themselves within proper range. After that the process of reducing the forts was purely mechanical. Mauberge held out a little longer than did the two Belgian fortresses in the Meuse Valley. But as soon as it was left to its own resources its days were numbered.

The French quickly learned the first big lesson of this war and abandoned to the enemy the other frontier fortresses which they could not defend with the aid of mobile troops. They evacuated Lille, Laon, La Fère and Rheims when they were obliged to fall back before von Kluck's advance. They clung to Verdun and the other eastern frontier strongholds only because those formed a part of the actual battle line. Verdun has not yet been isolated, and the Germans have never been able to gain positions from which they could bombard it at leisure with their big guns. It would doubtless fall, as other fortresses have fallen, if it should be once stripped of the defence which the presence of large bodies of mobile troops has assured it.

The Belgian field army fought valiantly to keep the Germans at a safe distance from the outer ring of Antwerp's forts. A new outer circle had been planned to supplement the inner circle, deemed sufficient twenty years ago. But these works were not completed or fully armed. For nearly two months, while the Germans had their hands full in Northeastern France, the Belgian army kept the invaders at arm's length. But the protracted deadlock on the Aisne enabled the Germans to turn their attention again to isolated Antwerp, and when they drove the Belgians across the Nethe River to the southwest of the city they got the foothold necessary for an effective bombardment. After that the Belgian authorities had to choose between evacuation or subjecting the city to useless destruction.

The official report from Berlin says that the Belgian army withdrew on Friday, making its way toward the west. The city had not been invested on that side, and the Germans probably did not have sufficient forces to attack from all quarters. It is probable that the greater part of the Belgian troops retreated toward Ghent or to the north of Ghent, toward Bruges and Ostend. The situation had not been in that part of Belgium for several weeks. Their outposts were between Brussels and Ghent, and the presence of a body of their cavalry was reported on Friday at Courtrai, southwest of Ghent and northeast of Lille.

The allied turning movement has now been pushed across the Belgian border, and the troops retreating from Antwerp may be able to get in touch with the garrison of Ostend and the French cavalry operating between Lille and the Channel coast. The Germans will naturally try to prevent this junction by hemming King Albert's army in against the Dutch border. But if they have enough troops in Belgium to undertake such a movement it is hard to understand why they did not invest Antwerp on all sides and thus compel the garrison to surrender outright or to make a dash northward into Holland.

It was beyond the strength of the Allies to raise the siege of Antwerp. Keeping in view the rational development of their campaign and adapting their present efforts to their resources they could not risk an insufficiently supported movement into Northern Belgium. Belgium's fate depends in the last analysis on the outcome of the fighting on the Aisne and on the line from Verdun to Toul. But while Antwerp could not be saved, General Joffre's flanking movement to the north may have cleared the way for the retreat of the Belgian field army and extricated it in time to play an important part in the defence of the Belgian and French Channel ports.

The fall of Antwerp will have a considerable moral effect. It will encourage those among the Germans who are willing to shut their eyes to the enormity of the toll which Germany is exacting from an unoffending and helpless neutral state. It may impress some people outside Germany who still worship the doctrine that might makes right. But it will not materially affect the course of the war.

In a military sense the advantages gained by

the reduction of Antwerp are relatively unimportant. The investing army can now be used in operations further to the west, and all danger of an attack from the rear on the German line of communications through Liège to Aix-la-Chapelle has been removed. But these results are of secondary value. As a base for naval operations Antwerp is useless. The outlet to the sea by the Scheldt River is through Dutch territory, and Germany has, moreover, no means at present of getting any part of her fleet into Antwerp. As a station for Zeppelins mobilizing against England Antwerp has some advantages. But a Zeppelin base there would be more exposed to British aeroplane attacks than is a base in Düsseldorf or Cologne. The occupation of Brussels, Belgium's capital and largest city, and practically no military effect. The taking over of Antwerp, after an evacuation, will be of scarcely any greater value in helping Germany to accomplish her primary purpose of overrunning and crushing France.

## Discretion, Not Reformation.

It must grieve the patronage brokers who have been playing politics with the Workmen's Compensation Commission that the appointment of ten assistant deputy commissioners has been postponed. It will not grieve the public. The only grief the public will feel on the subject is that shrewd politics—the fear that another patronage grab now might imperil Governor Glynn's chances—should have dictated this postponement rather than a desire for straight work and real economy. The payroll of this great department is already padded with political jobholders. Ten deputy commissioners at \$4,000 a year are holding down easy jobs. Of the ten, five owe their appointment to the fact that they are Democratic political workers and three others to political and labor union influence. The place is so cluttered with jobholders that the recently imported general manager discharged twenty-six useless ones as his first official act. The postponement of the appointment of ten more salary eaters shows discretion on the part of Tammany. Unfortunately it does not mean reformation.

## Misleading Sample Ballots.

It is unfortunate that the "John Doe" sample ballots distributed at the registration places for the guidance of voters contain serious mistakes. These ballots, under the election law, are required to be precisely the same as those for use on Election Day, save as to the color of the paper and the use of the name "John Doe" in place of actual names of candidates. They actually are so different from what the correct ballot should be that their issuance seems inexcusable.

Opposite the spaces for names of candidates for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State and Controller the party emblems and the names of the Progressive and Socialist parties are grouped. The inference is that there were fusion nominees for these places. Socialists never fuse. The Independence League name and emblem are grouped with the Democratic name and emblem opposite the space for the name of the candidate for Lieutenant Governor, whereas the Independence League endorsed Mr. Schoebeck, the Republican candidate. The Independence League, by similar grouping, is represented as endorsing the Democratic candidate for Attorney General, although it nominated a candidate of its own.

The wide distribution of such ballots is bound to be misleading. It may result in many spoiled ballots or in the casting of ballots contrary to the wishes of the voters. There should be immediate investigation and official action to rectify these errors. If they are mistakes only, they are mistakes which demand a lot of explaining. If they are something else—and it must be recognized that the implication of these ballot errors is to the benefit of the Democrats—no explanation can possibly suffice.

## The Peace Party of England and the End of the War.

Almost the first real and bitter quarrel within the boundaries of England since the war began has arisen over the efforts of certain workers for peace to look forward to the end of the war and endeavor to influence public opinion in favor of liberal peace terms. The Union of Democratic Control is the organization proposed to carry on a propaganda already formulated by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Mr. Charles Trevelyan and Mr. Norman Angell, among others. Their programme is simple enough and for the greater part sound in American eyes. It was so stated, however, as to arouse the Unionist newspapers to anger, and the outburst of party feeling is a suggestive hint of the political dispute which is certain to blaze up in England the instant a victorious peace is in sight.

For a good summary of the peace conditions suggested we take the words of Mr. Norman Angell in a letter to "The Spectator":

What we have proposed is that in the future peace should not be transferred without some consent of the consent of their population; that international engagements should in future have constitutional sanction; that there should be some sincere attempt made to create a council of the nations and to reduce armaments. These things may be Utopian and impracticable; but, as some one remarked the other day, the choice seems to be between "Utopia and hell."

Thus temperately and moderately phrased, it is hard to see how anybody's wrath could have been aroused. To be sure, the original proposal went into greater detail, demanding, for instance, a plebiscite of the population of a province before it should be transferred. This will appeal to most people as a fantastic and impracticable condition, one which it would be all but impossible to execute impartially. But the underlying idea is unquestionably sound. "The Spectator," while laboring the peace gentlemen as "self-righteous sophists," hastened to quote from its own columns to show that it had gone on record against any body snatching. It had said as long ago as August 15:

To put the matter in a nutshell, we must not manufacture moral explosives by detaching provinces that do not want to be detached. Better provinces that are longing for restoration is, of course, altogether another matter.

There is also on record the striking statement by Mr. Winston Churchill contained in an interview in the "Giornale d'Italia." The First Lord of the Admiralty cannot be accused of standing with the radicals of his party, and his militarist faith is public property. Yet said he:

We want this war to settle the map of Europe on national lines and according to the true wishes of the peoples who dwell in the disputed areas. After all the blood that is being shed, we want a natural and harmonious settlement, which liberates races,

restores the integrity of nations, subjugates no one and permits a genuine and lasting relief from the waste and tension of armaments under which we suffered so long.

Of course, the Peace Union demanded other things as well, greater publicity and popular control of foreign affairs and, as Mr. Angell put it, "some sincere attempt made to create a council of the nations and to reduce armaments." Neither of these proposals seems exactly revolutionary. A possible concert of European powers looking toward disarmament was mentioned regretfully in Sir Edward Grey's last cable to Berlin before the outbreak of hostilities. Why, then, this flood of hostility to so righteous a movement?

The bulk of the answer is the unavoidable truth that the settlement of peace terms will be by no means easy, no matter how united public opinion is on general principles. Even accepting such statements as that of Mr. Churchill at their full value, the possibility of disagreement is enormous. The racial lines in such communities as Alsace-Lorraine, Trent and Trieste, Schleswig-Holstein and German Poland are inextricably confused. A plebiscite would probably only increase the debatable points. It is one thing to lay down a general rule of complete righteousness and quite another thing to apply it to the intricacies of European populations.

Upon this opportunity for sincere dispute controversy will be built. The militarists will insist upon stripping Germany of every debatable province which has military value, just as Von Moltke prevailed over Bismarck and effected the seizure of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871. Broadly, the dispute is likely to be fought out along existing party lines, the Unionist view being that of the military, the Liberal view holding to the more democratic rule. It is not necessary to consider that either side will be altogether right or altogether wrong. You will find few Englishmen today to defend their nation's unpreparedness, the work of Liberal statesmen. Military necessity may rightfully play a part in determining boundaries where a large population is not affected. The democratic spirits of England need not pursue any such precise and mathematical ideal as that laid down by the Peace Union. Rather their aim should be to prevent a repetition of the Von Moltke blunder in Alsace-Lorraine. Where such a blunder is threatened only good judgment and wise statesmanship can determine.

## A NEW SCOTCH REEL.

(These lines, contributed to "The London Times," were written at Antwerp, when it was occupied by a regiment of Highlanders, with their pipes.)

Dance, since ye're dancing, William,  
Dance up and down,  
Set to your partners, William,  
We'll play the tune!  
See, make a bow to Paris,  
Here's Antwerp-teen;  
Off to the Gulf of Riga,  
Back to Verdun  
Ay, but I'm thinking, laddie,  
Ye'll use your shoon!  
Dance, since ye're dancing, William,  
Dance up and down,  
Set to your partners, William,  
We'll play the tune!  
What! Wad ye stop the pipers?  
Nay, 'tis over-soon!  
Dance, since ye're dancing, William,  
Dance, ye pair loon!  
Dan - till ye're dizzy, William,  
Dance till ye swoon!  
Dance till ye're dead, my laddie!  
We play the tune!

## IT'S A LONG, LONG WAY TO—

(From The London Pall Mall Gazette.)  
HELOISE DE PICARDIE.  
Englishman, Englishman, marching by the vine,  
Singing such a merry song, and airy,  
Tell me is this Tipperary, sunny land of mine,  
Half so much jollie as Tipperairee?

M. ATKINS DE LONDRES.  
What oh!—Tipperary, Miss?—Honest, I dunno:  
Only wot some donah, name of Mary,  
Lives there, and from Lunnion it's a stiffish bit  
To go.  
That's all I can tell of Tipperary.

HELOISE DE PICARDIE.  
Highlander, Highlander, rollicking along;  
How you sing so prettily, mon cher!  
Tell me of the valley you are praising in your song  
Are the blossoms fair in Tipperairee?

CAPORAL "MAC" DE GLESCA.  
Bonnie lass, bonnie lass, we be Scots sae braw,  
Therefore we be canny men and wary,  
Aibins we micht tell a lass of hoo the gowans  
Graw.  
Naethin' do we ken o' Tipperary.

HELOISE DE PICARDIE.  
Irishman, Irishman, singing to the breeze,  
Warbling of your country and the fairy  
Waiting for her soldier in your Erin overseas,  
Tell me of your love and Tipperairee!

LE FUSILIER O'HARA.  
Bless yer soul, achuala! sure ye've got me in  
a spell,  
Askin' such a question; for I've nary  
Sweetheart—less yerself 'il say the word; an',  
I've niver set a fut in Tipperary.

## BARBAROUS NEW YORK

A Pessimistic View of Peace in a Great City.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: Cruel, inhuman, barbarous is the war in Europe, as war always is, especially when hate, revenge and selfishness are the causes. Earliest civilized, at least polished on the surface, the German and the Allies' kettle are calling each other black. New York reads of neutrality (isolated, dum-dum bullets, but of neutrality and atrocities on women. In peaceful neutrality we hold high our hands in holy horror and think thanks that thugs like these we are not.

However, the barbarous armies of Europe have not yet tried to poison each other, while New York allows the sale of rotten food poisoned with sulphites and sodium benzoate.

New York denies clean and decent homes, sunshine even, to thousands of babies and feeds them with milk from tuberculous cows. New York, too, is murdering the innocents.

This city robs thousands of children of the right to play. The old Greenwich Village district has not even one square foot of playground for each child. The children are starving in the Tombs during the hot months, waiting for many of them innocent, while judges and magistrates enjoy a three months' vacation.

The glare of burning cities and the hunted look in the eyes of the homeless haunt us, while thousands in New York City are being evicted for not being able to pay their rent in advance.

The dropping of bombs on the helpless and the burning of homes as we saw on barbarians, but at the same time, we are sacrificing scores of our own people in our crowded fire trap tenements and waiting for the next Triangle horror.

We stand aghast, at the human fodder being fed to cannon and machine guns and allow the gasoline machines on our streets to kill thirty-five children and seventeen adults in a month.

We clutch our fists at the reported atrocities committed by the soldiers on women, but what about the more than twenty thousand wronged women on the streets of New York? They are dripping with blood, and which all the water from the Catskills will not wash off, for that, too, will be tainted with the blood of nearly three hundred workmen killed in the aqueduct construction. Look on Europe in its cruel war and I cry: "How long, O Lord, how long?" I look at New York City, barbarous in peace, and I am dumb!

New York, Oct. 9, 1914. JONAS SEIBERT.



"Hoch der Kaiser!"

## THE PEOPLE'S COLUMN

An Open Forum for Public Debate.

## THE NEXT WAR

Present: Battling Called Child's Play Compared with What Future Militarists Will Contrive.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Why, this war is nothing compared to the coming war. Future generations and nations, especially those not cultured, will look upon a German 42-ton siege gun as a mere toy gun of the past. This war is mere practice. Army mechanics are simply trying out their skill and learning their deficiencies in some of the most modern war machines, so that they may improve them in the near future. Killing 1,000 men a day and burning a city a week are a mere beginning.

I read the other day that a celebrated German professor is now at work on a telephone whereby the German army may be able to think. Another Berlin professor is working on a wish-fulfilling machine whereby the enemy will do just what the German war staff wishes it to do. Both professors are hastening in the work and have promised the Kaiser to have these two instruments, if not some more, ready for the next real war. Each professor will receive an iron cross for his contribution to civilization and progress.

MAX WEBER.  
New York, Oct. 9, 1914.

## NO CHANCE FOR THE VALIANT

On a Par with Weaklings in Modern Warfare.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In spite of your correspondent's "tart criticism" of a feminist's view, it is nevertheless true that the strong and courageous soldier of today hasn't the chance of surviving today that the "valiant gentleman of the sword" had in the days when knights were bold. Formerly, when fighting depended mostly on hand-to-hand encounter, a man could defend his own life as well as attack his enemy's. If he were strong and skilled in swordsmanship he could hold off two or three opponents at a time. This was no game for weaklings; the weaklings perished. The fighting was individual, and each man fought for himself. It took a strong arm and a quick, calculating brain. It was plainly a case of the survival of the fittest.

To-day the "vigorous young manhood" and the weaklings are alike mown down by the merciless shower of lead. Whole lines are swept away at a single volley. The valiant have no more chance for life than the cowards, and it is due to the divine hand of Providence that one man lives while another perishes.

GEORGE W. VAN SICLEN.  
New York, Oct. 9, 1914.

## ENGLAND'S "INFAMY"

A Request Is Made for Dates and Facts.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Mr. Alfred Laurens Brennan, one of those gentlemen who do not know that Oliver Cromwell died some time ago, issues a challenge to Viscount Bryce to deny that England has "broken and even laughed at several scores of treaties" during the last three hundred years. No doubt his lordship's attention will be directed to Mr. Brennan's challenge, but I would suggest that it would be desirable for Mr. Brennan to furnish a bill of particulars, as otherwise the author of "The American Commonwealth" may

merely cable a denial and let it go at that. Of the several scores of treaties that England has broken and laughed at, Mr. Brennan can no doubt recall a number of specific examples. Bring along your facts and dates, Mr. Brennan, so that we may know the depth and extent of England's infamy.

SCOTT ROBINSON.  
Brooklyn, Oct. 8, 1914.

## GERMANY MUST WIN

So a Reader Views the Consequence of Her "Superior Race of Men."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Pray let one who is strongly pro-German pipe up a bit against the shallow self-assurance of Mr. Jerome K. Jerome and his critic, Mr. Charles K. Sleaf, both of whom, in the most offhand way imaginable, declare that England will win.

One guess may be as good as another, but guessing is of no account in matters of immense magnitude whereof the spiritual forces which distinguish a superior race of men array themselves against the material resources of a widespread dominion.

England's allies are virtually three: 1. France, whose heroism is scarcely anywhere matched, but whose national condition is such that she would have been wholly prostrated before to-day had the Germans not waited the five days they did wait for Belgium's permission to cross her territory; 2. Russia, whose resource in men is practically illimitable, but whose governmental conditions are so utterly bad in every way which makes for sterling national efficiency that she cannot possibly arm, supply, transport and sustain her eight or ten millions of men at all; 3. Belgium, whose martial couragelessness outstrips all else that she possesses, but whose hopelessly mistaken attitude (as a willing buffer state for the benefit of England—witness Antwerp's principal fortifications, all placed as against Germany) has now resulted in her destruction.

This arrangement of the prime factors involved very clearly indicates the inevitable outcome. It conclusively leaves England eventually high and dry on the reefs of disaster, whence she cannot (or at least will not) be rescued by her colonialists, simply because her colonialists do not half care whether she survives or not.

This latter manifests itself in the circumstance that throughout the past six frightful weeks her colonies have not sent her half a million men.

ALFRED LAURENS BRENNAN.  
New York, Oct. 10, 1914.

## WOMAN'S INDEPENDENCE

Efforts to Restrict Her Along Economic Lines Are Opposed.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is admitted by your correspondent, Mrs. Sefton, that there are married teachers who have relations able and willing to care for their children. But those who are so situated, in her opinion, are comparatively few, and the rule must be made to fit the majority. What is to be gained by such an attitude? Why is a rule needed at all? I doubt many women would feel unable to teach and attend to the duties of motherhood at the same time. Under such circumstances teachers will abandon their occupation without the compulsion of any ruling. On the other hand, if a married woman with a child has the desire and energy, as many have, to contribute to the social

welfare by teaching, why should she not be permitted to do so? Why not allow the question to be decided by the teachers themselves according to their individual needs and abilities?

The assertion that only unmarried women should be employed as teachers is decidedly reactionary. The fact that a married teacher may deprive an unmarried one of a position should not enter into the discussion. Such a possibility is the fault of a system of society which makes an opportunity to be useful a privilege to be fought for, and often denied. Some day, with the help of women, we will reorganize society along saner lines. In the mean time mothers should not be made to bear the brunt of our social shortcomings.

Some of our ablest thinkers have declared that in economic independence lies the solution of the woman problem. It is certain that every step which tends to overcome the idea which is entertained by some persons that woman should be a parasite and to establish the truth that every woman should justify her existence by productive work of some kind is a step in the right direction. All attempts to restrict women's efforts along economic lines are working against real progress and are entirely at variance with the spirit of the times.

E. W. VAN VALKENBURGH.  
East Orange, N. J., Oct. 8, 1914.

## VIRGINIA PROHIBITION

Like Every Other Brand of Aridity, Declares License League.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your recent editorial on the Virginia result you call attention to the fact that wine, cider and beer may still be made when the new order prevails, provided they are shipped outside the state. Then you add: "Besides protecting thus in its bosom certain interests permanently arrayed in active opposition to prohibition, Virginia at the very outset destroys all moral sanction for the enforcement of its law."

After all, is this very different from the prohibition movement's position in other supposedly "dry" states?

Is there any more hypocrisy here than in any of the other states voted "dry" with a great flourish, but always with provision made for an undiminished liquor supply from outside?

If the liquor business itself is sinful, as the prohibitionists urge, why is not the use of liquor equally sinful? Yet where do the prohibitionists try to make it so? Where do they honestly try to make prohibition a reality by the use of the federal Webb-Kenyon statute, passed, we were told, to enforce prohibition states to achieve real aridity?

T. M. GILMORE.  
President National Model License League.  
New York, Oct. 8, 1914.

## Remember Rheims and Louvain!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am a daughter of the American Revolution, which in itself says that my ancestors fought against England. They came from England also, which perhaps accounts somewhat for my feeling toward that country. While I hope my country will remain strictly neutral in this great struggle, I feel sure that most of my countrymen hope for the success of the Allies, and condemn the nation which ravages a country as Germany has done. Remember Rheims and Louvain!

ANNA GERTRUDE ROBERTS.  
Dobbs Ferry-on-the-Hudson, Oct. 8, 1914.

## ENGLAND'S INDIAN SOLDIER

With Some Comment on the Opinion of the Yankee.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In reply to "American Edition" in "The Overland," everybody agrees with "P. W. P." It is over the atrocities of the English and those who were practically their allies and blood will never be fresh and blood will never be fresh. But that was in an unexcusable, and perhaps the English were uncultured at the time. If these were hired at that time (hiring was to be England's leading policy in war) and were being well paid for doing, is it not wholly to the disgrace of England? If the English of to-day are said to be a barbaric, war-loving people, what could be expected of them over a century ago?

Regarding the United States slaves in the Civil War to the freedom of the negro slaves was the cause of the war had not the slaves, if they so desired, a right to fight for their freedom? Every negro in the Spanish-American War was a citizen of the United States, as such had the right of every citizen to fight and die for his country. In this direction they nobly shown to us.

Whereas the Congolese fighting for Great Britain are merely slaves who for years have been under the yoke of the invaders of their country, men who are ignorant of what the cause of the war is or why they are fighting, are barbarians, who, though they are the French and British, are not, need but the slightest suggestion that they are to die of blood, which their heathen religion taught them to see in the light of glory to the individual.

Because more English were persecuted during about the last century and came here for freedom of living, does it rest that England owes this great country? Were not the Dutch, French, Polish and other nationalities, even at that well represented? England, however, have "given" us this country, she desired it as a source of revenue for Great Britain's Revolutionary War! It proves this fact: The Englishman's contempt for the "Yankee" is a well known fact. To the Englishman, it is more or less an historical error that we are a country to-day. How many are migrating to this land for American citizens?

It is a well known fact that the German comes here and becomes an American citizen, and ambitious and does not care for the German name and ancestry, still, England has Canada and colonies to offer her surplus population. Germany has not this advantage, and therefore her people migrate to the country that will give them the freedom which the mother country gives them, and we are not ashamed to receive them as we are. But the German is grateful to the government which so bountifully provides him what his mother country would have refused him. He is a land sturdy and clean, and his children and his population.

Portion of our population. University Heights, New York, Oct. 8, 1914.

The Tribune wishes to remind readers that anonymous letters are not printed in this column. The names and addresses of the writers are not printed in every case. Those who are signed in every case, those who are not, are the property of the writer or printer.